

Appl. No. 10/000,252
Amdt. dated March 19, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 20, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 5-10 are pending. Claims 1-4 have been canceled. Claim 5 has been amended to more clearly define that the thermal interface material forms a fillet between at least one beveled sidewall and the heat dissipation device. No new subject matter has been added with the amendment.

A. 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) – Lii - Claims 1 and 4

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,936,304 issued August 10, 1999 to Mirng-Ji Lii, et al. (hereinafter “the Lii patent”) (Office Action, page 2).

Claims 1 and 4 have been canceled without prejudice. Thus, the current rejection is moot. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 102(b) rejection are respectfully requested.

B. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

M.P.E.P. 706.02(j) sets forth the standard for a Section 103(a) rejection:

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach

Appl. No. 10/000,252
Amdt. dated March 19, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 20, 2004

or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Claims 2 and 3

Claims 2 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the3 Lii patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,455,920 issued September 24, 2002 to Norio Fukasawa, et al. (hereinafter "the Fukasawa patent") (Office Action, page3).

Claims 2 and 3 have been canceled without prejudice. Thus, the current rejection is moot. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 8-10

Claims 5 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the3 Lii patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,693,981 issued December 2, 1997 to Mark Schneider and Joseph Joroski (hereinafter "the Schneider patent") (Office Action, page3).

Independent claim 5, from which claims 8-10 directly depend, has been amended to more clearly define that the thermal interface material forms at least one fillet between the heat dissipation device and the at least one beveled sidewall. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification on page 10, line 20 through page 11, line 6, and in Figures 6 and 7.

Appl. No. 10/000,252
Amdt. dated March 19, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 20, 2004

The Lii patent is relied upon for a teaching of a beveled sidewall extending between a channel sidewall and a back surface of a microelectronic die, and for a teaching of a metallization layer disposed on the microelectronic die back surface and at least one beveled sidewall. The Schneider patent is relied upon for a teaching of a copper heat sink dissipating heat from an electronic component.

However, neither the Lii patent nor the Schneider patent, either only or in combination, teach or suggest that the thermal interface material forms at least one fillet between the heat dissipation device and the at least one beveled sidewall, as required by the presently amended claims. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 5 and 8-10.

Claims 6 and 7

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over the Lii patent in view of the Schneider patent and the Fukasawa patent (Office Action, page4).

Claims 6 and 7 either directly or indirectly depended from claim 5. Therefore, the arguments with regard to the rejection of claim 5 are equally applicable and are incorporated herein by reference. Furthermore, the Fukasawa patent, either alone or in combination with the Lii patent and/or the Schneider patent, also does not teach or suggest that the thermal interface

Appl. No. 10/000,252
Amdt. dated March 19, 2004
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 20, 2004

material forms at least one fillet between the heat dissipation device and the at least one beveled sidewall.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 6 and 7.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants request allowance of the application. Please forward further communications to the address of record. If the Examiner needs to contact the below-signed attorney to further the prosecution of the application, the contact number is (503) 712-1682.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert G. Winkle
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 37,474

Dated: April 19, 2004